

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are all the claims pending in the application. Claims 1-13 stand rejected on prior art grounds. Applicants gratefully acknowledge the allowance of claims 17-20. Claims 14-16 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Accordingly, the limitations of claim 14 are incorporated into independent claim 10 to place claims 10-16 in condition for allowance. Claim 4 is objected to because of informalities. However, the Applicants submit that no change to claim 4 other than changing the dependency of the claim to independent claim 1 is required. Claims 1, 2, 4, 10, 14, and 15 are amended herein. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections based on the following discussion.

I. The Prior Art Rejections

Claims 1-2, 5-10, and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Krivokapic (U.S. Patent No. 6,294,412). Claims 3-4, 11, and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Krivokapic in view of Applicant Admitted Prior Art (Fig. 1, text [0005]), hereinafter referred to as "AAPA". Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections based on the following discussion.

The claimed invention, as provided in amended independent claim 1 contains features, which are patentably distinguishable from the prior art references of record. Specifically, claim 1 provides, in part, "...forming a second region of a second dopant type in said substrate, said second region comprising a second edge aligned to a second edge of said first structure, said

second region being of a different dopant type than said first region....” Krivokapic clearly does not provide a first region having a first dopant type and a second region having a second dopant type, wherein the first and second dopant types are different from one another. Rather, Krivokapic (FIGS. 15 and 16 and column 7, lines 25-28) teaches only one type of dopant region (p-type region 94). Therefore, the Applicants’ claimed invention teaches features not taught or rendered obvious by the prior art of record. Moreover, the Applicants note that all claims are properly supported in the specification and accompanying drawings, and no new matter is being added. In view of the foregoing, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections.

II. Formal Matters and Conclusion


With respect to the rejections to the claims, the claims have been amended, above, to overcome these rejections. In view of the foregoing, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections to the claims.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that claims 1-20, all the claims presently pending in the application, are patentably distinct from the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to pass the above application to issue at the earliest possible time.

Should the Examiner find the application to be other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the local telephone number listed below to discuss any other changes deemed necessary. Please charge any deficiencies and credit any overpayments to Attorney’s Deposit Account Number 09-0456.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 24, 2006

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Mohammad S. Rahman", written over a horizontal line.

Mohammad S. Rahman
Registration No. 43,029

Gibb I.P. Law Firm, LLC
2568-A Riva Road, Suite 304
Annapolis, MD 21401
Voice: (301) 261-8625
Fax: (301) 261-8825
Customer Number: 29154